10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

was a difficult one, so long as they held high office. Each of these men was a thinker and theologian of distinction whose writings are regarded as having high authority in the Orthodox Church. Philaret in particular was the author of the celebrated *Confession* which bears his name and the translator into Russian of the Acts of the Synod of Jerusalem, with its important variations from the original (see p. 89). He was interested also in projects for educational and financial reform. But the autocratic action of the sovereign and the paralysing effect of the régime of the Holy Synod with its Procurator made it clear that the State must find more pliable material to fill the highest offices in the Church. Both Platon and Philaret were dismissed to their own dioceses and retired in official disgrace, although each of them continued to exercise great influence through his writing and preaching.

In the summer of 1917, between the March and October Revolutions, the All-Russian Church Council met in Moscow. Its members were both clerical and lay and representative of all classes within the Russian Church. It embarked upon the planning of a wide programme of administrative reform, it swept away Peter's Holy Governing Synod, and restored the Patriarchate of Moscow. Tikhon, Metropolitan of Moscow, whose name was soon to become well-known throughout the world, was appointed by lot from among three elected candidates, to occupy the Patriarchal Throne.

After the triumph of the Bolsheviks and the establishment of the Soviet Government, the world was startled to witness the attempt of a modern Government to suppress religion.[1] No doubt the close association of the Russian Church with the hated Tsarist régime of which it had on occasion shown itself the willing agent, helped to exacerbate the hostility with which the men who had overthrown the Tsar regarded the Church. But it is important to note that their hostility was not directed to this or that bad feature of any particular manifestation of religion, but against religion as such, and, if some of their spokesmen are to be believed, against "good" religion even

[1] For a balanced and judicious examination of the whole struggle, see P. B. Anderson: *People's Church and State in Modern Russia*. S.C.M. Press, 1944.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples
Great Russia RF1

•798 more than "bad". They adopted with enthusiasm the philosophy of Karl Marx and his interpretation of history, and were sincerely convinced that the welfare of mankind necessitated the "liquidation" of religion. No effort was spared and much skill and ingenuity were employed to achieve this end. But though great suffering was caused to individual men and women, and the external organization of the Russian Church was for a time unable to function, and although large numbers of people were induced to abandon at least the outward profession of their faith, yet the lapse of time made it clear that the religion of Russia was not to be eliminated either by physical repression or by argument and propaganda, and that the secular authorities would have to come to terms with it.

659 The process of finding a *modus vivendi* was greatly facilitated in consequence of the Second German War. When Hitler invaded Russia, the Russian Church unhesitatingly embraced its share in the sufferings of the whole people, gave its blessing to the armies which defended Russian soil and called for national solidarity under the leadership of the Soviet Government in the protection of the Fatherland. In turn the Government decided that it no longer had anything to fear from the Church and was glad to enlist its help in the conduct of the great struggle.

How far, if at all, the new relation of Church and State has been purchased by modification and adjustments of the Church's ideals and standards, time will show. The public utterances of Soviet churchmen today have nothing but thanks and congratulations to offer the secular authority. The Church, they say, is free to live its spiritual life and, what is more, always has been since the October Revolution. The outsider who reads this may be pardoned a suspicion that the lady doth protest too much and that the heroic spiritual power which held its own unbowed before the onslaughts of a foe, has to some extent succumbed to the seductive blandishments of a friend. Yet such a judgment may after all turn out to be unfounded and unfair. If the Russian Church has indeed found a way, with its spiritual integrity unimpaired, to co-operate with an atheist secular authority, not only can it do much if it will to contribute to the sorely needed understanding between Russia